

III. REMARKS

A new Abstract page is submitted herewith, which omits the unintended reference to "Figure 4" as the last line thereof.

Claims 19 and 20 are amended to replace the term "spot" with the term --area--.

Claims 17 and 46 are amended to define both of the first and second coating layers as being "substantially transparent", as originally disclosed on page 3, lines 3 to 5 and page 4, lines 28-29 of the specification.

Claims 47 and 48 are cancelled as redundant.

New claims 49 and 50 are introduced to specifically cover embodiments where one interference effect results from light reflection and the other interference effect results from destructive interference caused by the thickness of the other layer.

Referring to the Office Action, the Examiner's Comments regarding the broad interpretation of the phrase "interference effect" in the claims illustrate a misunderstanding of the present invention. The present invention requires the application of substantially transparent coating layers to different areas of a surface of an object, which coating layers create different light interference effects at the same wavelength of visible light. While it is true that one such interference effect can result from reflection it is not true that an interference effect can be produced by absorption of light by the coating, such as by an image or word typed on a

white paper. A coating which absorbs light is not transparent and/or cannot reflect light.

The "extreme example" referred to by the Examiner on page 7 of the present specification is not an illustration of the present invention but rather is an illustration of light contrasts in the absence of any coatings due to light reflection from an uncoated surface such as words typed on a white paper background.

The Examiner argues that there is no support for both coating layers being substantially transparent. Applicant again refers to the disclosure at page 3, lines 3-5 and at page 4, lines 28-30. If the present coatings were not transparent light could not penetrate to the underlying boundary surfaces to create different interference effects in the first and second area.

It is respectfully submitted that the present claims patentably distinguish over the Curiel U.S. Patent 4,913,543 which discloses an alternation-resistant article containing variable data, such as an automobile registration plate or drivers license, containing an outer film, an adhesive layer, a hologram layer for receiving variable data thereon, and a substrate adhesively bonded to the hologram layer.

There is absolutely no disclosure or suggestion in Curiel of applying first and second transparent optical coatings on first and second areas to an object to create first and second interference effects at the same predetermined wavelength of visible light, which interference effects are different from each other, such as one being visible to the naked eye and the other being invisible to the naked eye.

The interference effect with visible light requires that visible light must interfere with itself or with another light source. This is different from reading a text, such as a patent copy, using visible light which reflects from the white paper background and is absorbed by the black printed text, without any interference of the visible light. Conversely, the present invention employs two coatings which are transparent, such as antireflection coatings which create different interference effects at the same wavelength of visible light, to provide discernibly-different images or areas on a substrate, such as from substantially transparent coatings. There is no disclosure or suggestion of such a concept in the Curiel Patent.

The holograms and hologram particles of Curiel are not transparent. They merely reflect light from their surfaces. They do not have optical coatings with optical properties for creating different first and second interference effects.

It is also respectfully submitted that the present method claims patentably distinguish over Curiel in view of Prince et al. and Dobrowolski. The Examiner admits that Curiel does not disclose the claimed coating methods. Prince et al. disclose and claims a process of physically-ablating a carbon layer and then discriminating by etching. This has nothing to do with the present method claims. Similarly, Dobrowolski has nothing to do with applying coatings to different areas to create different interference effects.

The Pennace Patent 5,296,949 is not pertinent to the steps of method claims 16 and 45 since it has no disclosure relating to the application of different coatings for creating different interference effects on different areas of a substrate.

Also, the other secondary references applied to the claims previous to the present amendment are not pertinent to the essential elements of the present invention as presently claimed.

The prior art of record differs critically from the present method and product claims which employ at least two different interference effects on different areas of a support to produce areas having different interference effects in transparent coatings at the same wavelength of visible light, without any requirement for removing any portions of optical coatings. One or more coatings may be printed through a mask or aligning tray to provide a design, pattern or indicia on areas of said support, over or under areas of the other coatings, whereby some areas of the substrate are covered by superposed coatings and other areas are covered by only the printed coating. Successive layers transparent may be applied or printed thereover to produce additional interference phenomena in addition to the contrasting interference effects provided by uncoated areas of the substrate. No removal of any essential areas of the coatings is required.

According to the preferred embodiment of the invention, the first and second areas of the substrate are coated transparent areas which produce in one of said areas an open identifier such as a trademark or trade name which is visible to the naked eye while producing in the other area a protected identifier such as the word "licensed" or a patent number, which is invisible to the naked eye but is visible under photon radiation or other radiation. This enables the manufacturer to detect counterfeit,

unlicensed or otherwise unauthorized products, as disclosed at page 8, line 31, to page 9, line 5 of the specification.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Enclosed is a check in the amount of \$430.00 for a two month extension of time is enclosed. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,



Janik Marcovici
Reg. No. 42,841

11/5/04
Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800
Customer No.: 2512

The PTO did not receive the following
listed item(s) check for \$430.00

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22213-1450

Date: 11/10/04

Signature: Janina Murphy
Person Making Deposit